

Parks System Development Charges

Prepared For



July 11, 2016



Introduction

System development charges (SDCs) are an important funding source for parks capital improvement projects. The City of Woodburn last updated its Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan and SDC methodology in 1999. The City adopted a new Parks and Recreation Master Plan in 2009, which includes an updated list of planned capital improvements and priorities. The proposed park SDCs presented in this report are intended to bring the SDCs into alignment with current cost and planning assumptions contained in the Master Plan, and to incorporate a reimbursement component for existing park capacity that will help meet the needs of future development.

Oregon legislation establishes guidelines for the calculation of SDCs. Within these guidelines, local governments have some latitude in selecting technical approaches and establishing policies related to the development and administration of SDCs. A discussion of this legislation follows; the recommended methodology for calculating parks SDCs is presented in Section 2.

SDC Legislation in Oregon

In the 1989 Oregon state legislative session, a bill was passed that created a uniform framework for the imposition of SDCs statewide. This legislation (Oregon Revised Statute [ORS] 223.297-223.314), which became effective on July 1, 1991, (with subsequent amendments), authorizes local governments to assess SDCs for the following types of capital improvements:

- Drainage and flood control
- Water supply, treatment, and distribution
- Wastewater collection, transmission, treatment, and disposal
- Transportation
- Parks and recreation

The legislation provides guidelines on the calculation and modification of SDCs, accounting requirements to track SDC revenues, and the adoption of administrative review procedures.

SDC Structure

SDCs can be developed as: (1) a reimbursement fee, (2) an improvement fee, or (3) a combination of the two. The **reimbursement fee** is based on the costs of capital improvements *already constructed or under construction*. The legislation requires the reimbursement fee to be established or modified by an ordinance or resolution setting forth the methodology used to calculate the charge. This methodology must consider the cost of existing facilities, prior contributions by existing users, gifts or grants from federal or state government or private persons, the value of unused capacity available for future system

users, rate-making principles employed to finance the capital improvements, and other relevant factors. The objective of the methodology must be that future system users contribute no more than an equitable share of the capital costs of *existing* facilities. Reimbursement fee revenues are restricted only to capital expenditures for the specific system which they are assessed, including debt service.

The methodology for establishing or modifying an **improvement fee** must be specified in an ordinance or resolution that demonstrates consideration of the *projected costs of capital improvements identified in an adopted plan and list*, that are needed to increase capacity in the system to meet the demands of new development. Revenues generated through improvement fees are dedicated to capacity-increasing capital improvements or the repayment of debt on such improvements. An increase in capacity is established if an improvement increases the level of service provided by existing facilities or provides new facilities.

In many systems, growth needs will be met through a combination of existing available capacity and future capacity-enhancing improvements. Therefore, the law provides for a **combined fee** (reimbursement plus improvement component). However, when such a fee is developed, the methodology must demonstrate that the charge is not based on providing the same system capacity.

Credits

The legislation requires that a credit be provided against the improvement fee for the construction of “qualified public improvements.” Qualified public improvements are improvements that are required as a condition of development approval, identified in the system’s capital improvement program, and either (1) not located on or contiguous to the property being developed, or (2) located in whole or in part, on or contiguous to, property that is the subject of development approval and required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related.

Update and Review

The methodology for establishing or modifying improvement or reimbursement fees shall be available for public inspection. The local government must maintain a list of persons who have made a written request for notification prior to the adoption or amendment of such fees. The legislation includes provisions regarding notification of hearings and filing for reviews. “Periodic application of an adopted specific cost index or... modification to any of the factors related to the rate that are incorporated in the established methodology” are not considered “modifications” to the SDC. As such, the local government is not required to adhere to the notification provisions. The criteria for making adjustments to the SDC rate, which do not constitute a change in the methodology, are further defined as follows:

- “Factors related to the rate” are limited to changes to costs in materials, labor, or real property as applied to projects in the required project list.
- The cost index must consider average change in costs in materials, labor, or real property and must be an index published for purposes other than SDC rate setting.

The notification requirements for changes to the fees that *do* represent a modification to the methodology are 90-day written notice prior to first public hearing, with the SDC methodology available for review 60 days prior to public hearing.

Other Provisions

Other provisions of the legislation require:

- Preparation of a capital improvement program or comparable plan (prior to the establishment of a SDC), that includes a list of the improvements that the jurisdiction intends to fund with improvement fee revenues and the estimated timing, cost, and eligible portion of each improvement.
- Deposit of SDC revenues into dedicated accounts and annual accounting of revenues and expenditures, including a list of the amount spent on each project funded, in whole or in part, by SDC revenues.
- Creation of an administrative appeals procedure, in accordance with the legislation, whereby a citizen or other interested party may challenge an expenditure of SDC revenues.

The provisions of the legislation are invalidated if they are construed to impair the local government's bond obligations or the ability of the local government to issue new bonds or other financing.

SDC Methodology

Overview

The methodology used to calculate parks SDCs begins with determination of the “cost basis” (the costs in aggregate associated with meeting the capacity needs of growth). Then, growth costs are divided by the projected growth units (population and employees) to determine the system-wide unit costs of capacity. Finally, the SDC schedule is developed which identifies how the system-wide costs will be assessed to individual development types.

Population and Employment

Park capacity is measured in terms of people served –resident population and resident and nonresident employees. Table 1 provides population and employment data derived from recent City planning documents for use in the SDC analysis.

Table 1
City of Woodburn
Park SDC Analysis
Population and Employment Data

Item	Prior	Existing	Projected		
	2000		2020	2025	2035
Population ¹	20,860	24,670	34,919	36,068	41,170
Employment ²	10,388	14,575	18,762	19,175	21,668
Equivalent Population ³	20,860	26,460	37,223	38,422	43,831
<i>Recent Growth⁴</i>		5,600			
<i>Future Growth</i>				11,962	

¹ Based on Legislative findings on remand

² From City of Woodburn

³ Population plus equivalent employee population (12%)

⁴ The increment of existing development since 2000 (subject to prior SDCs)

The concept of equivalent population is used to recognize different utilization levels of parks by the general population (used to estimate residential development capacity needs) and employees (used to estimate nonresidential development needs). For purposes of this analysis, the equivalent population for nonresidential development is equal to 12 percent of total employees. This analysis reflects the ratio of estimated future park use by residents to park use by employees (see Appendix Tables A-1 and A-2 for more details).

The planning period for the SDC capital improvement plan (CIP) is 2025. However, the planned community center is assumed to meet service area needs through 2035. As shown in Table 1, future growth in population and employees through 2025 is estimated to be 11,398 and 4,600, respectively. Growth in equivalent population is estimated to be 11,962 (about 31 percent) of the projected 2025 total, and is used as a basis for determining planned levels of service for parks and facilities (discussed further below).

The City has been collecting SDCs since 2000 to pay for park improvements. That recent growth represents about 21 percent of the existing equivalent population, and represents the portion of costs that may be funded through existing SDC reserves.

Capacity Analysis

The City – through adoption of the Parks Master Plan -- is planning for acquisition and development of the parks system consistent with the community's desired level of service (LOS). In order to equitably fund the CIP, both new development and existing park users will need to contribute to the improvements at a level that reflects their relative needs, as determined by the planned LOS. The planned LOS for a particular park or facility is defined as the quantity of future City-owned park acreage or facilities per 1,000 equivalent population served.

The following equation shows the calculation of the planned LOS:

$$\frac{\text{Existing } Q + \text{Planned } Q}{\text{Future Population Served}} = \text{Planned LOS}$$

Where:

Q = quantity (acres of parks, miles of trails, or number of facilities), and
Future Population Served = projected 2025 equivalent population

Table 2 shows the existing and future LOS by park type and trails. The City's Master Plan identifies the following park classifications:

- Core parks (neighborhood, community, mini, and municipal parks)
- Urban/Special Use parks
- Natural area
- Greenways

The capacity requirements, or number of park acres or trail miles, needed for the existing population and for the growth population are estimated by multiplying the planned (future) LOS for each park type (from Table 2) by the equivalent population of each group (from Table 1). Table 3 shows this capacity analysis for each park type, and for the Mill Creek Trail land and development.

Table 2

City of Woodburn

Park SDC Analysis

Existing and Planned Levels of Service

Type	Unit Measure	Existing		Existing		Future		Future	
		Total	LOS	Developed	LOS	Total	LOS	Developed	LOS
			(Units/ 1,000)		(Units/ 1,000)		(Units/ 1,000)		(Units/ 1,000)
		Units	1,000)	Units	1,000)	Units	1,000)	Units	1,000)
Parks and Open Space									
Core Parks (1)	Acres	64.72	2.45	64.72	2.45	79.72	2.07	79.72	2.07
Urban/Special Use (2)	Acres	2.07	0.08	2.07	0.08	2.07	0.05	2.07	0.05
Natural Area (3)	Acres	20.01	0.76	0.00	0.00	20.01	0.52	0.00	0.00
Greenways (4)	Acres	8.11	0.31	0.00	0.00	8.11	0.21	0.00	0.00
Recreation Trails									
Mill Creek Trail	Miles	2.43	0.09	1.00	0.04	6.01	0.16	6.01	0.16
Total City-Owned Acres		94.91	3.59	66.79	2.52	109.91	2.86	81.79	2.13

(1) Neighborhood, Mini, Community, Municipal

(2) Downtown Plaza, Cowan, Library, and Locomotive Parks

(3) Senecal Park

(4) Hermanson parks; Wyfells park

Table 3

City of Woodburn

Capacity Analysis

Park Type	Total Future Units ¹	Existing Population		Growth Population			Project list Allocation				Reimbursement	
		Total Need	Existing (Surplus) / Deficit	Total Need	From Existing Inventory	From Project List	Existing		Growth		Units	%
							Units	%	Units	%		
Core Parks	79.7	54.9	(9.8)	24.8	9.8	15.0	0.0	0.0%	15.0	100.0%	9.8	15.2%
Urban/Special Use	2.1	1.4	(0.6)	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.6	31.1%
Natural Areas	20.0	13.8	(6.2)	6.2	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	6.2	31.1%
Greenways	8.1	5.6	(2.5)	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	2.5	31.1%
Mill Creek Trail (Land)	6.0	4.1	1.7	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.7	47.7%	1.9	52.3%	0.0	0.0%
Mill Creek Trail (Dev.)	6.0	4.1	3.1	1.9	0.0	1.9	3.1	62.7%	1.9	37.3%	0.0	0.0%

¹ From Table 2

As shown in Table 3, the City has varying degrees of excess (surplus) capacity in existing park acreage; however, there is a deficit for the Mill Creek Trail – both in terms of total land owned and developed -- compared to the planning standard. Additional acreage included in the CIP is limited to 15 acres of core parks (both land purchase and development). Based on the planned LOS shown in Table 2, future growth requires almost 25 acres of Core Park land, of which almost 10 acres is provided through current excess capacity (Reimbursement column in Table 2), and 15 acres is provided from new CIP (Project List) investment. Available capacity in other park types varies from 0.6 acres for Urban/Special Use Parks, to 6.2 acres for Natural Areas.

The Mill Creek Trail is primarily a new facility (the City currently owns a portion of the land for the trail, and has developed 1 mile of the planned 6 miles). Based on the planned LOS, future growth requires 1.9 miles of the planned investment in additional land and development.

A separate capacity analysis (shown in Table 4) was conducted for parks and recreation facilities. Similar to the park land analysis, the capacity analysis for facilities is based on the planned LOS. As shown in Table 4, the planned LOS for facilities is shown as the equivalent population served per facility. In some cases, the additional planned investment will yield an enhanced LOS – meaning that the number of people served by a single facility is lower (e.g., basketball, loop walks and shelters). In other cases, new facilities types are being added (spray features, sport courts, and a boundless playground and community center). For facilities with enhanced LOS – either existing or new facility types – a portion of the planned investment is needed to meet the needs of existing development. In other cases, where the planned LOS declines (meaning each facility will serve a higher equivalent population than currently), all of the new investment is needed for future development (such is the case for fire stations and playgrounds).

Table 4

City of Woodburn

Park SDC Analysis

Capacity Analysis and Project List Allocations for Facilities

Facility Type	Existing Inventory (1)	Existing Per Equiv. Pop.	Future Facilities (1)	Planned Per Equiv. Pop.	Existing		Growth			
					Need (Each)	Project List %	Need (Each)	Project List %	Reimb Inv.	Reimb %
Ballfield	5.0	5,292	6.0	6,404	0.00	0.00%	1.9	100.00%	0.9	17%
Ballfield, complex	1.0	26,460	1.0	38,422	0.00	0.00%	0.3	na	0.3	31%
Basketball	2.5	10,584	5.5	6,986	1.29	42.92%	1.7	57.08%	0.0	0%
Loop Walk	3.0	8,820	5.0	7,684	0.44	0.00%	1.6	77.83%	0.0	0%
Multi-use Fields	5.0	5,292	7.0	5,489	0.00	0.00%	2.2	100.00%	0.2	4%
Open Turf	11.0	2,405	11.0	3,493	0.00	0.00%	3.4	na	3.4	31%
Playgrounds	8.0	3,307	10.0	3,842	0.00	0.00%	3.1	100.00%	1.1	14%
Shelter	8.0	3,307	13.0	2,956	0.95	19.05%	4.0	80.95%	0.0	0%
Parcourse	1.0	26,460	1.0	38,422	0.00	0.00%	0.3	na	0.3	31%
Skate Park	1.0	26,460	1.0	38,422	0.00	0.00%	0.3	na	0.3	31%
Tennis	2.0	13,230	3.0	12,807	0.07	0.00%	0.9	93.40%	0.0	0%
Spray Feature	0.0	0	2.0	19,211	1.38	68.87%	0.6	31.13%	0.0	0%
Sport Court	0.0	0	2.0	19,211	1.38	68.87%	0.6	31.13%	0.0	0%
Boundless Playground	0.0	0	1.0	38,422	0.69	68.87%	0.3	31.13%	0.0	0%
Community Center	0.0	0	1.0	43,831	0.6	60.37%	0.3	27.29%	0.0	0%

(1) City owned only

Cost Basis

As noted in Section 1, Oregon law provides that SDC may include either or both of the following:

- *Improvement fee* – the portion of the SDC charged to cover an equitable share of the capital improvements needed to meet the service requirements of future development.
- *Reimbursement fee* – the portion of the SDC charged to recoup the community’s past investment in parks and facilities related to the capacity needs of future growth.

Improvement Fee

The current Parks CIP (based on the Parks Master Plan) includes almost \$26 million in improvements to existing parks and facilities, and acquisition of additional land for Core Parks and the Mill Creek Trail. Table 5 provides a listing of park improvements during the planning period, and an allocation of costs between existing development (recent and prior to 2000), and future development (growth). As mentioned previously, the CIP is generally a 10-year planning horizon; however, some major facilities (Community Center and existing Worl Berry Museum/Theater) are assumed to serve population through 2035; only the portion serving future development through 2025 is included in the SDC cost basis. The Total improvement fee cost basis is \$11.4 million.

The SDC project list shown in Table 5 identifies the portion of planned capital project costs that are related to future (post 2015) development, for purposes of calculating the updated SDCs. As mentioned previously, the City has been collecting SDCs since 2000 to pay for a portion of the planned parks improvements. Growth since 2000 (shown as “Recent Growth” in Table 1) represents almost 21 percent of the existing equivalent population, and represents the portion of costs that may be funded through existing SDC reserves. The current SDC reserves are approximately \$0.2 million, and area assumed to fund short term priority projects (projects planned for 2016-2019).

Reimbursement Fee

The reimbursement fee cost basis is the sum of the value of the existing system inventory funded by City revenues that will serve growth. The capacity requirements for existing development and growth were developed in Tables 2-4 for the City’s parks, trails, and facilities. Existing acreage and facilities that exceed the capacity requirement of existing development are available to meet the needs of growth. As Tables 3 and 4 indicate, the existing system has available (surplus) capacity in acreage for all parks, and many facilities.

Table 6 shows the calculation of the reimbursement fee cost basis. The City’s existing fixed asset records were used to determine the cost of prior investment in parks and facilities; the reimbursement allocation percentages from Tables 3 and 4 were then used to determine the cost of each line item eligible for reimbursement. As shown in Table 6, the reimbursement fee cost basis totals almost \$1.5 million.

Table 5										
City of Woodburn										
Park SDC Analysis										
<i>Improvement Fee Cost Basis (SDC Project List)</i>										
			Allocation (%)			Allocation (\$)				
	Time Period	Cost	Prior Dev.	Recent Dev.	Future Growth	Prior Dev.	Recent Dev.	Future Growth	Allocation Basis	Total SDC-Eligible
New Parks - Greenway Trail										
Acquire properties for Mill Creek Greenway	2016-2019	\$200,000	38%	10%	52%	\$75,263	\$20,204	\$104,534	Trail LOS (Land)	\$124,737
Acquire properties for Mill Creek Greenway	2020-2022	\$200,000	48%		52%	\$95,466		\$104,534	Trail LOS (Land)	\$104,534
Acquire properties for Mill Creek Greenway	2023-2025	\$200,000	48%		52%	\$95,466		\$104,534	Trail LOS (Land)	\$104,534
Develop Mill Creek Greenway	2020-2022	\$800,000	63%		37%	\$501,213		\$298,787	Trail LOS (Dev)	\$298,787
Develop Mill Creek Greenway	2023-2025	\$800,000	63%		37%	\$501,213		\$298,787	Trail LOS (Dev)	\$298,787
New Parks - Neighborhood/Community										
Acquire New park in SW area E. of I-5	2016-2019	\$500,000	0%		100%	\$0		\$500,000	Core LOS	\$500,000
Acquire New park in SE area	2020-2022	\$500,000	0%		100%	\$0		\$500,000	Core LOS	\$500,000
Acquire New park in W area	2023-2025	\$500,000	0%		100%	\$0		\$500,000	Core LOS	\$500,000
Develop New park in SW area E. of I-5	2016-2019	\$500,000	0%		100%	\$0		\$500,000	Core LOS	\$500,000
Develop New park in SE area	2020-2022	\$500,000	0%		100%	\$0		\$500,000	Core LOS	\$500,000
Develop New park in W area	2023-2025	\$500,000	0%		100%	\$0		\$500,000	Core LOS	\$500,000
New Facilities										
Community Center	2020-2022	\$11,100,000	60%		27%	\$6,700,848		\$3,029,417	Facility LOS	\$3,029,417
Improvements to Existing Parks										
Add spray feature at Centennial Park	2016-2019	\$200,000	54%	15%	31%	\$108,584	\$29,148	\$62,268	Facility LOS	\$91,416
Restore Wyffels Park	2016-2019	\$200,000	54%	15%	31%	\$108,584	\$29,148	\$62,268	Nat Area Reimb	\$91,416
Mill Creek Trail at Wyffels Park	2016-2019	\$250,000	49%	13%	37%	\$123,482	\$33,148	\$93,371	Trail LOS (Dev)	\$126,518
Burlingham Park restroom and pathways	2016-2019	\$480,000	67%	18%	15%	\$321,000	\$86,170	\$72,831	Core Reimb	\$159,000
Burlingham Park picnic shelter	2016-2019	\$20,000	15%	4%	81%	\$3,004	\$806	\$16,190	Facility LOS	\$16,996
Park comfort and convenience features	2016-2019	\$45,000	67%	18%	15%	\$30,094	\$8,078	\$6,828	Core Reimb	\$14,906
Park comfort and convenience features	2020-2022	\$45,000	85%		15%	\$38,172	\$0	\$6,828	Core Reimb	\$6,828
Park comfort and convenience features	2023-2025	\$45,000	85%		15%	\$38,172	\$0	\$6,828	Core Reimb	\$6,828
North Front Street Park sport court	2016-2019	\$60,000	54%	15%	31%	\$32,575	\$8,745	\$18,680	Facility LOS	\$27,425
Install shelter and irrigation at dog park	2016-2019	\$80,000	67%	18%	15%	\$53,500	\$14,362	\$12,138	Core Reimb	\$26,500

Table 5										
City of Woodburn										
Park SDC Analysis										
<i>Improvement Fee Cost Basis Cont. (SDC Project List)</i>										
	Time Period	Cost	Allocation (%)			Allocation (\$)			Allocation Basis	Total SDC-Eligible
			Prior Dev.	Recent Dev.	Future Growth	Prior Dev.	Recent Dev.	Future Growth		
Renovate Legion Park according to Master Plan	2020-2022	\$1,033,000	85%		15%	\$876,262	\$0	\$156,738	Core Reimb	\$156,738
Turf Field	2020-2022	\$1,375,000	0%		100%	\$0	\$0	\$1,375,000	Facility LOS	\$1,375,000
Basketball	2020-2022	\$65,000	43%		57%	\$27,899	\$0	\$37,101	Facility LOS	\$37,101
Playground	2020-2022	\$27,000	0%		100%	\$0	\$0	\$27,000	Facility LOS	\$27,000
Boundless Playground	2020-2022	\$500,000	69%		31%	\$344,330	\$0	\$155,670	Facility LOS	\$155,670
Baseball Field/Lighting/Fencing	2020-2022	\$600,000	0%		100%	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	Facility LOS	\$600,000
Picnic Shelter	2020-2022	\$20,000	19%		81%	\$3,810	\$0	\$16,190	Facility LOS	\$16,190
Pathways	2020-2022	\$100,000	85%		15%	\$84,827	\$0	\$15,173	Core Reimb	\$15,173
Settlemier Park Comfort & Convenience features	2023-2025	\$1,200,000	85%		15%	\$1,017,923	\$0	\$182,077	Core Reimb	\$182,077
Shelters (2)	2023-2025	\$350,000	19%		81%	\$66,681	\$0	\$283,319	Facility LOS	\$283,319
Basketball Court	2023-2025	\$100,000	43%		57%	\$42,921	\$0	\$57,079	Facility LOS	\$57,079
Playground	2023-2025	\$200,000	0%		100%	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	Facility LOS	\$200,000
Tennis Court	2023-2025	\$150,000	7%		93%	\$9,897	\$0	\$140,103	Facility LOS	\$140,103
Nelson Park pathways	2023-2025	\$110,000	85%		15%	\$93,310	\$0	\$16,690	Core Reimb	\$16,690
Soccer Field	2023-2025	\$300,000	0%		100%	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	Facility LOS	\$300,000
Picnic Shelter	2023-2025	\$30,000	19%		81%	\$5,716	\$0	\$24,284	Facility LOS	\$24,284
Sport Court	2023-2025	\$60,000	69%		31%	\$41,320	\$0	\$18,680	Facility LOS	\$18,680
Existing Facilities										
Renovate World Berry Museum/Bungalow Theater	2023-2025	\$1,500,000	60%		27%	\$905,520	\$0	\$409,381	Facility LOS	\$409,381
Spray Feature at Aquatic Center	2020-2022	\$250,000	69%		31%	\$172,165	\$0	\$77,835	Facility LOS	\$77,835
		\$25,695,000				\$12,519,218	\$229,808	\$11,391,140		11,620,948

Table 6						
City of Woodburn						
Park SDC Analysis						
<i>Reimbursement Fee Cost Basis</i>						
	Original Cost	Other Funding	Net Cost	Reimbursement		Allocation Basis
				%	\$	
Park Land						
Core Parks	\$1,096,204	\$0	\$1,096,204	15%	\$166,328	Core Reimb
Urban/Special Use	\$37,034	\$0	\$37,034	31%	\$11,530	Urban Reimb
Park Development						
Legion	\$682,648	\$278,000	\$404,648	15%	\$61,397	Core Reimb
Centennial	\$1,262,161	\$500,000	\$762,161	15%	\$115,643	Core Reimb
Ballfield	\$222,937	\$0	\$222,937	17%	\$38,704	Facility Reimb
Settlemier	\$88,181	\$0	\$88,181	15%	\$13,380	Core Reimb
Skate Park	\$211,447	\$0	\$211,447	31%	\$65,832	Facility Reimb
Greenway	\$483,879	\$210,000	\$273,879	0%	\$0	Trail Reimb
Playgrounds	\$191,999	\$91,900	\$100,099	14%	\$13,931	Facility Reimb
Picnic Shelter	\$16,246	\$0	\$16,246	0%	\$0	Facility Reimb
General	\$104,077	\$0	\$104,077	31%	\$32,403	Population
Existing Facilities						
Pool	\$3,462,279	\$0	\$3,462,279	27%	\$944,927	Facility Reimb
Museum	\$91,972	\$0	\$91,972	27%	\$25,101	Facility Reimb
	\$7,951,064	\$1,079,900	\$6,871,164		\$1,489,175	

Compliance Costs

Local governments are entitled to include in the SDCs, the costs associated with complying with the SDC statutes. Compliance costs include costs related to developing the SDC methodology and project list (i.e., a portion of planning costs), and annual budgeting and reporting. As shown in Table 7, the estimated compliance costs over the 10-year planning period are approximate \$105,000.

Table 7
City of Carlton
Parks SDC Analysis
Compliance Costs

	Total
Parks Plan	\$35,196
SDC Methodology	\$20,000
Accounting, Reporting	\$50,000
Total	\$105,196

SDC Schedule

Unit Costs

To determine the SDC schedule, the system-wide unit costs of capacity are first determined, as shown in Table 8. The unit cost calculations begin with allocation of the cost basis between residential and nonresidential development. For SDC development purposes, park costs are allocated to residential and nonresidential development based on each group's share of future equivalent population. As shown in Table 1, total growth in equivalent population is estimated to be 11,962, including 11,398 new residents (95 percent) and 565 nonresidential equivalents¹ (5 percent). Based on these allocations, residential development is allocated \$12.4 million (combined reimbursement and improvement costs), and nonresidential is allocated \$0.6 million of future growth-related park costs from Tables 5-8. Compliance costs are allocated to each group in proportion to the total capital costs.

Table 8
City of Woodburn
Parks SDC Analysis
SDC Unit Cost Calculation

	Capital	Growth \$ Compliance	Total	Growth Units	\$/Unit
Improvement Fee					
Residential	\$10,853,326		\$10,853,326	11,398	\$952
Nonresidential	\$537,814		\$537,814	4,600	\$117
Total	\$11,391,140	\$0	\$11,391,140		
Reimbursement Fee					
Residential	\$1,418,867	\$100,229	\$1,519,096	11,398	\$133
Nonresidential	\$70,309	\$4,966.65	\$75,276	4,600	\$16
Total	\$1,489,175	\$105,196	\$1,594,371		

The growth capacity units for both residential and nonresidential developments are people; in the case of residential it is total population, and in the case of nonresidential the unit of measure is employment. The growth in population and employment during the 10-year planning period is estimated to be 11,398 and 4,600, respectively. Dividing the residential cost by the total growth in population yields improvement and reimbursement unit costs per person of \$952 and \$133, respectively. Similarly, the unit costs for nonresidential are \$117 (improvement) and \$16 (reimbursement) per employee.

SDC Schedule

SDCs are assessed to different development types based on average dwelling occupancy and employee density (employees per thousand square feet), as estimated by local or regional data. Planning data for the City does not show significant difference in occupancy

¹ As discussed previously, the nonresidential equivalents are equal to the number of employees multiplied by an equivalency factor of 12 percent.

for different types of dwelling unit types; therefore a uniform SDC of \$3,365 per dwelling unit (based on occupancy of 3.1 persons per household) is recommended. This compares to a current SDC of \$1,752 for single family and \$1,882 for multifamily currently.

Table 9
City of Woodburn
Parks SDC Analysis
Parks SDC Schedule

Development Type	Units	Updated	Current
Residential (\$/dwelling unit)	pphh		
Single-Family	3.1	\$3,365	\$1,752
Multifamily (>1 unit)	3.1	\$3,365	\$1,882
Nonresidential (\$/employee)		\$133	\$31

The updated nonresidential SDC per employees is \$133, compared to \$31 currently. For nonresidential development, the SDC is assessed based on estimated employees (generally based on employment density and building size).

Inflationary Adjustments

In accordance with Oregon statutes, it is recommended that the SDCs be adjusted annually based on a standard inflationary index. Because parks SDCs include both land acquisition and facility improvement, the City currently uses a combination of indices to annually adjust charges:

- Change in Average Market Value from rom the County Tax Assessor
- Engineering News Record (ENR) Northwest Construction Cost Index

Appendix

Table A-1

City of Woodburn

Parks SDC Study

Weighted Average Park Availability Hours by Class

Season/Period	Residential			
	Not-Employed Adult	Kids (5-17)	Employed Adult	Non-Residential
Summer				
Weekday				
Before Work				1
Breaks				1
After Work				2
Other Leisure	12	12	2	0
Subtotal	12	12	2	4
Weekend				
Leisure	12	12	12	0
Subtotal	12	12	12	0
Hours/Day	12.00	12.00	4.86	2.86
Spring/Fall				
Weekday				
Before Work				0.5
Breaks				1
After Work				1
Other Leisure	10	4	2	0
Subtotal	10	4	2	2.5
Weekend				
Leisure	10	10	10	0
Subtotal	10	10	10	0
Hours/Day	10.00	5.71	4.29	1.79
Winter				
Weekday				
Before Work				0.5
Breaks				1
After Work				0.5
Other Leisure	8	2	1	0
Subtotal	8	2	1	2
Weekend				
Leisure	8	8	8	0
Subtotal	8	8	8	0
Hours/Day	8.00	3.71	3.00	1.43
Annual Avg. Weighted Hours	10.00	7.14	4.05	2.02

Table A-2

City of Woodburn

Parks SDC Study

Determination of Parks Equivalent Population Ratio

Category	Growth Units	Avg. Hours Per person/day	Unit Hours/Day	% Total
Population				
Kids (5-17)	2,566	7.14	18,320	
Non-Employed Adults (18+)	2,616	10	26,156	
Employed Adults (18+)	5,438			
Work In City	1,564	4.05	6,329	
Work out of City	3,875	4.05	15,681	
Subtotal	10,620		66,485	88%
Employees				
Residents	1,564	2.02	3,164	
Nonresidents	3,036	2.02	6,143	
Subtotal	4,600		9,307	12%
Total	15,219		75,792	